

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 were rejected in the last Office Action in this matter under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner took the position that those five claims were obvious, given the teachings of United States Patent No. 6,266,397 (Stoner), in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 5,343,509 (Dounies).

Claims 6, 8-9 and 11 were rejected on the same statutory basis. In making that rejection, the examiner took the position that, given the teachings of the Stoner patent, those four claims would be obvious in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 6,104,784 (Robbins).

Applicant requested a personal interview at the United States Patent and Trademark Office with the examiner. Examiner George Eng graciously entertained the visit of the inventor, Martin D. Moody, and the undersigned on December 11, 2003. It is believed that the interview was very helpful in allowing the Applicant to submit a proposed claim for discussion and to elucidate why it is thought that that claim should be patentable. The examiner pointed out a number of issues relative to which he felt the claims were unclear. In fact, what had originally been believed to be a question of claim breadth took on a nature more of claim ambiguity with § 112

ramifications. For example, the examiner did not feel there was sufficient definition of the term "network" initially articulated in the preamble of Claim 1.

Applicant hereby amends Claim 1 and cancels Claims 6, 8-9 and 11. The cancellation of these four claims is without prejudice, and Applicant may consider pursuing the subject matter of those claims in a continuing application. It is believed that the subject matter of Claims 1-5 can, thereby, be more efficiently focused upon in this case.

By this AMENDMENT, Applicant does hereby rejoin the arguments submitted in the AMENDMENT of July 18, 2003. Specifically, Applicant would submit that neither the Stoner patent, by itself, nor that patent, with any other reference of record, either anticipates or renders obvious Claim 1. The Stoner reference uses a transmission path that is outside of the emergency system depicted in that reference. Consequently, the Stoner technology must incorporate adjunct equipment in the emergency system in order to function. Stoner does not, therefore, include "an initiator for implementing transmission into the emergency system..." As pointed out in the last AMENDMENT, it must be borne in mind that the present invention drives the identification of a particular one of multiple transmission sources without there being any need for adjunct equipment. This is an important feature of the invention.

Further, however, Applicant would supplement the remarks of the last AMENDMENT with the following comments. The network previously recited has been modified to define it as a "local communications network". Such a local communications network as claimed and as illustrated in the drawing figures is of a type known by those of skill in the art.

Claim 1 has also been amended to define the local communications network not as "having related" multiple transmission sources, but, rather, as "including supported" multiple transmission sources. This amendatory language is also included to obviate what the examiner felt was an ambiguity in Claim 1.

Even further, the emergency system, which is also a structure of a type known by those of skill in the art, was amended to be defined as "including an emergency system database". It is submitted that this amendatory language obviates another ambiguity which the examiner felt existed.

Finally, Claim 1 has been amended by transposing the structure originally defined as element (b) and the structure originally defined as element (c). It is felt that this is a more logical sequence of introduction, since the order of introduction of elements now more closely follows the sequence of operation of the various component structures.

Applicant would point out that the structure of the Stoner patent sends "secondary" information to an adjunct, non-standard piece of equipment located at the PSAP. In view of the multiple transmission sources and multiple locations of those sources, an emergency call can end up being delivered to the wrong PSAP. Consequently, the call must be transferred to another PSAP, one that should initially have gotten the call. The call and, resultantly, the emergency response end up being delayed because the call originally being sent to a potentially wrong PSAP.

In contrast, the present invention, as defined by Claim 1, does not allow for such delays. This is true in view of the fact that the emergency message processor of Claim 1 provides indicia which are primary information items used by the emergency system to route an emergency call to the proper PSAP in view of the caller's geographic location.

In view of the amendments made hereby and these comments offered in support of patentability, it is sincerely believed that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. In view of the fact that Claims 2-5 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon Claim 1, it is submitted that Claims 2-5 are patentable on the same basis as is Claim 1. Allowance of the application (and, specifically, Claims 1-5) is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any over payment to
Deposit Account 14-0620.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin D. Moody

By his attorney

Date June 8, 2004

Lawrence M. Nawrocki
Lawrence M. Nawrocki
Reg. No. 29,333
NAWROCKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON, P.A.
Suite 401, Broadway Place East
3433 Broadway St. N.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55413
(612) 331-1464